Paper PD12

The Half-Life of Skills: Leading When Today's Expertise is Tomorrow's Obsolete

Pratibha Jalui, Cytel Inc., India

ABSTRACT

What if your most valuable skill today is already on its way to becoming irrelevant? In a world where the half-life of skills is shrinking rapidly, sometimes to just two years, leaders face a hidden crisis: how to stay relevant when expertise comes with an expiry date. This session will challenge the way you think about learning, leading, and letting go. We will explore why some teams fade while others thrive, and how learning agility, rather than static knowledge, is becoming the ultimate leadership currency. You will also discover practical steps to prepare yourself and your teams for the future. Through real-world case studies, surprising industry data, and modern leadership strategies like reverse mentoring and quick learning sprints, you will walk away with a blueprint to build teams that can adapt quickly and stay ahead. Indeed, in this era, your biggest risk is not falling behind. It is standing still.

INTRODUCTION

Across the global life sciences and healthcare ecosystem, the nature of work is being rewritten at unprecedented speed. New data modalities, AI-augmented workflows, evolving regulatory expectations, and platform-based operating models are transforming not only *what* work is done, but *how* value is created.

Within this transformation, APAC and particularly India's healthcare Global Capability Centers (GCCs) now occupies a position of strategic centrality. Once viewed primarily as engines of scale and efficiency, GCCs are increasingly becoming the nerve centers of global clinical development, data science, regulatory operations, and digital innovation. At the same time, a quieter but more profound disruption is underway: the rapid erosion of skills. Expertise that once lasted a decade now becomes obsolete in a few short years. Roles persist, titles remain, but the skills inside them decay at an accelerating pace. This is not a temporary talent cycle. This is a structural shift in the economics of knowledge work.

This paper represents a PHUSE APAC perspective on that shift and on the opportunity it creates. It argues that the next chapter of GCC evolution will not be defined by scale, cost, or even technical excellence alone, but by something more fundamental: **the ability to remain relentlessly relevant in a world where expertise expires.**

PART I – THE GREAT SKILL UNBUNDLING: WHEN EXPERTISE STOPS BEING DURABLE

A quiet failure. In a leading healthcare organization, a high-performing analytics team delivered every milestone. Yet within eighteen months, a new platform rollout rendered most of its workflows obsolete. The team did not fail. The system did. Titles remained, headcount was stable, and delivery continued while relevance quietly leaked away. This is no longer an exception but instead a well-defined pattern.

In industrial-era organizations, skills were treated as durable assets. Individuals trained, specialized, and then applied that expertise over long, stable career arcs. Organizations planned capability in multi-year cycles, confident that core competencies would remain relevant for a decade or more. That confidence has now become a liability. In today's healthcare and life sciences environment, driven by platform modernization, AI, real-world data, digital trials, and rapidly evolving regulatory expectations **skills have become perishable**.

The concept of skill half-life - the time it takes for half of one's knowledge or capability in a domain to lose its economic value has collapsed. The idea is borrowed from physics, where the half-life of an atom describes decay over time. Importantly, just as in physics, **knowledge does not become zero**: skills rarely disappear completely, but their **value declines**, often sharply, as tools, platforms, and operating models change.

In software engineering and data science, this half-life is often measured in two to three years. In analytics platforms and AI tooling, it can be even shorter. In operating models and workflows, it is under constant pressure from successive waves of technological change and evolving compliance regimes. And yet most talent systems, workforce planning models, and career architectures continue to assume stability. Roles persist. Titles remain. But the **skills inside them decay at exponential speed,** creating a dangerous illusion of continuity: the appearance of capability without its substance.

For many decades, professional growth followed a familiar narrative which was to learn, apply, perfect, lead, teach. In the new environment, the arc looks quite different - acquire, peak, decline, obsolete, reinvent. The implication is

profound. The primary risk to organizations is no longer skill shortage alone, but **skill stagnation**. The most valuable professionals are not those who know the most, but those who can **shed, rebuild, and recompose their expertise repeatedly**.

Across global studies and industry benchmarks, three signals are consistent: the pace of skill obsolescence is accelerating; time-to-productivity is increasing; and the gap between business need and available capability is widening. This should not be confused with cyclical labor-market phenomenon. It is a **structural capability synchronization failure**.

In clinical data management, biostatistics, programming, and regulatory operations, the pattern is increasingly clear: technical and tool-based skills decay the fastest; domain and process skills last longer but still erode; only **learning agility and adaptability** retain compounding value.
Skills fade. The ability to regenerate skills is what endures.

PART II – THE CAPABILITY GAP IS A SYSTEM PROBLEM: WHY GOOD PEOPLE GET TRAPPED IN BAD MODELS

If the skill crisis were purely a matter of individual effort, it would already have been solved. Across APAC's healthcare GCCs, motivation to learn is not the constraint. The constraint is systemic.

Across the PHUSE community, the same structural patterns appear with striking consistency: complacency born of past success; static roles designed for stability; progression measured by titles rather than impact; learning optimized for completion rather than capability shift; silos that trap expertise while problems increasingly span systems; technology adopted without redesigning work; and, most critically, a lack of true accountability for long-term relevance. These are not cultural accidents. They are the predictable outcomes of operating models that were never designed for continuous reinvention. Nowhere is this tension more visible than in the current identity of many GCCs. By any conventional metric, many are successful: they have scaled, improved efficiency, and delivered reliability. And yet a dangerous illusion is taking hold.

There is a fundamental difference between a **Cost Centre mindset**, focused on throughput and utilization, and a **Capability Centre mindset**, focused on leverage, impact, and strategic optionality. The former optimizes the present. The latter builds the future. The GCCs that will define the next decade will not be those that simply do more work, faster or cheaper. They will be those that **change what work is possible at all,** moving from the execution layer of the enterprise to its strategic nervous system.

This challenge is global, but its stakes are especially high in India and APAC. The region's healthcare GCC Ecosystem has crossed a threshold. It is no longer peripheral but foundational. Global clinical development, biostatistics, regulatory operations, and real-world evidence platforms increasingly depend on APAC-based capability hubs not just for scale, but for continuity, speed, and innovation.

This creates a strategic choice that cannot be deferred: **Will APAC's GCCs become the world's execution engine or its reinvention engine?**

APAC now stands at the intersection of explosive data growth, accelerating AI adoption, platform-driven operating models, increasing regulatory complexity, and a uniquely deep talent pool. This is not a shift in cost structures but a shift **in the center of gravity of industry**.

PHUSE, as a community, sits at the center of this moment: not as a passive observer, but as a convener, as someone who sets standards, and as a catalyst for capability evolution across the ecosystem.

PART III – THE THREE FRONTLINES OF REINVENTION: WHY TALENT, LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION MUST CHANGE TOGETHER

The capability gap does not emerge in one place. It emerges when change is **unsynchronized** across three dimensions: Talent, Leadership, and Organization.

At the level of **Talent**, skills now expire faster than roles. Reskilling can no longer be episodic; it must become continuous, embedded, and expected. At the level of **Leadership**, hiring does not equal capability. Leaders can no longer rely on buying skills from the market alone. They must **architect systems that grow capability internally.** At the level of **Organization**, learning cannot remain an event. Structures, roles, incentives, and workflows must evolve at the speed of change.

Reinvention that touches only one of these is not transformation. It is performance, not progress.

Around the world, leading organizations are responding, not with more training programs, but by redesigning their operating systems. They are building capability academies embedded into delivery, modular and stackable skill architectures, AI-augmented workflows that change the nature of work itself, and role models that assume constant evolution and the most advanced among them no longer speak of "upskilling initiatives." They speak of **capability as infrastructure.**

PART IV – WHAT ENDURES WHEN SKILLS DON'T: THE RISE OF META- CAPABILITY

In the old world, stability was strength, efficiency was strategy, and experience was insurance. In the new world, adaptability is advantage.

A small set of meta-capabilities now outlive any single domain skill: critical reasoning, systems thinking, storytelling and influence, technology fluency, and learning velocity. These are not "soft skills." They are the skills that regenerate all other skills. Organizations that build these capabilities systematically do not merely respond to change. They compound advantage from it.

PART V – FROM PROGRAMS TO POSTURE: RISE AS THE ARCHITECTURE OF CONTINUOUS REINVENTION

This paper proposes RISE as a practical architecture for continuous reinvention. Not as a program to be launched, but as a posture to be institutionalized. It is offered as personal thought leadership derived from years of observing what differentiates organizations that adapt from those that merely react.

To move from episodic change to continuous renewal, organizations need a different posture, not simply different initiatives:

- **Recognize** disruption early and honestly.
- **Integrate** learning into daily work.
- **Scale** capability, not just capacity.
- **Evolve** roles, structures, and leadership models.

RISE needs to be something that goes beyond being a program, to being an operating stance.

FROM INSIGHT TO ACTION: A PRACTICAL SELF-CHECK FOR LEADERS

The ideas in this paper are only useful if they change decisions. One simple way to begin is to hold up a mirror to the system, not to individuals and ask a small set of honest questions. This is **not** a scorecard or a compliance exercise. It is a leadership conversation starter.

- When did we last redesign a material portion of our roles, changing what work actually gets done, not just updating job descriptions?
- Do we measure learning in **hours completed** or in **capabilities that moved the business**?
- What percentage of our critical roles have a continuously refreshed capability roadmap?
- Are our best people rewarded primarily for **delivery** or for **building future capability**?
- Is AI in our organization mostly **automating yesterday's work** or **redefining tomorrow's work**?
- How easy is it for high performers to move across domains without leaving the organization?
- If we froze external hiring for 24 months, would our system get stronger or weaker?
- Do leaders spend more time reviewing performance or shaping future capability?
- Which of our current core skills would we be comfortable betting the organization on five years from now?
- Who, explicitly, owns the question of long-term relevance in our operating model?

The pattern of answers matters more than any single response. Organizations ready for the next era answer these questions with **systems**, not with **intentions**.

CONCLUSION – THE RELEVANCE IMPERATIVE: WHAT THE COMMUNITY MUST BUILD TOGETHER

Over the next three years, the ecosystem must move decisively from programs to platforms: from isolated initiatives to shared capability frameworks; from static role definitions to role architectures designed for motion; from episodic training to learning that is embedded in daily work; and from metrics that reward delivery alone to standards that recognize and reward capability building.

PHUSE is uniquely positioned to serve as the convener, the standard-setter, and the force multiplier for this shift by bringing together sponsors, CROs, and GCCs to not only align on what must change, but to **codify it, scale it, and sustain it across the industry**.

The next era will not be shaped by organizations that know the most. It will be shaped by those that can keep becoming something new. APAC's GCCs now have a once-in-a-generation opportunity: to move from delivery centers to

capability engines, from execution hubs to reinvention platforms, from scale to strategic relevance. The future belongs to the relentlessly relevant. And the PHUSE community is uniquely positioned to help the industry build it together.

REFERENCES

- Inductus GCC- 2024 GCC Annual Report
- ANSR - Healthcare & Lifesciences Industry Trends and GCC Landscape in India 2025
- PWC - Catalysing value creation in Indian global capability centers

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Ajay Sathe for his guidance, perspective, and constant encouragement throughout the development of this work. His insights, thoughtful challenges, and deep understanding of the PHUSE ecosystem have been instrumental in shaping both the narrative and the strategic depth of this paper. This work is significantly richer because of his involvement.

The author also thanks the many colleagues, peers, and members of the PHUSE community who, through conversations, feedback, and ideas, have helped shape and refine this work.

RECOMMENDED READING

Human: Solving the Global Workforce Crisis in Healthcare - Oxford University Press, 2019

CONTACT INFORMATION

Your comments and questions are valued and encouraged.
Contact the author at:

Author Name: Pratibha Jalui
Company: Cytel Inc.
Address: Remote/Bengaluru, India
Work Phone: +91 9619628671
Email: Pratibha.jalui@cytel.com
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/pratibha-jalui-7720b972